

CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS MAYOR'S OFFICE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT JOSEPH A. CURTATONE MAYOR

GEORGE J. PROAKIS EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PLANNING DIVISION

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEMBERS

ORSOLA SUSAN FONTANO, CHAIR DANIELLE EVANS, CLERK ELAINE SEVERINO JOSH SAFDIE ANNE BROCKELMAN DREW KANE, (ALT.) Case #: ZBA 2019-93 Site: 50 Inner Belt Road

Date of Decision: September 18, 2019
Decision: Approved with Conditions
Data File Leith City Challes

Date Filed with City Clerk: September 25, 2019

ZBA DECISION

Site: 50 Inner Belt Road

Applicant Name: Commodore Builders

Applicant Address: 404 Wyman Street, Waltham, MA 02451

Owner Name: Penna Realty Associates, LLC

Owner Address: 228 Andover Street, Wilmington, MA 01887

City Councilor: Matt McLaughlin

Legal Notice: Applicant, Commodore Builders, and Owner, Penna Realty Associates, LLC, seeks a

Variance under SZO §5.5 and §10.7 to construct an eight foot tall fence. IA Zone. Ward 1.

Zoning District/Ward:IA Zone. Ward 1.Zoning Approval Sought:SZO §5.5 and §10.7Date of Application:August 7, 2019Date of Decision:September 18, 2019Date of Decision:September 18, 2019

Vote: 5-0

Case number ZBA 2019-93 was opened before the Zoning Board of Appeals in the Council Chambers of City Hall at 93 Highland Avenue. Notice of the Public Hearing was given to persons affected and was published and posted, all as required by M.G.L. c. 40A, sec. 11 and the Somerville Zoning Ordinance. On September 18, 2019, the Zoning Board of Appeals took a vote.



I.PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is to construct an eight foot tall fence around the front and two sides of the subject property and a ten foot tall privacy fence within the site.

II. FINDINGS FOR SPECIAL PERMIT (§5.5 and §10.7):

A Variance (§5.5) is sought to install an eight foot tall fence and a ten foot tall fence. The SZO §10.7 states that fences may not be more than six (6) feet high above the existing grade.

In order to grant a variance the Board must make certain findings and determinations as outlined in §5.5.3 of the SZO.

1. There are "special circumstances relating to soil conditions, shape or topography of land or structures which especially affect such land or structures but not affecting generally the zoning district in which it is located, causing substantial hardship, financial or otherwise."

Applicant's response: The property is bordered by a few different fences. In terms of the surrounding land, the MBTA train tracks are right next to the property. They sit about 12 feet above the building and have a direct view into the building area. The building parking lot is a large open area that can be accessed by anyone. There is currently no fence or physical barrier between the elevated train tracks and the property. A strong steel fence would not only provide security for the secure data center, but also provide security for those who park and sit in the parking lot bordered by the unfenced train tracks.

Board response: The adjacency of elevated railroad tracks is a special circumstance.

2. "The variance requested is the minimum variance that will grant reasonable relief to the owner, and is necessary for a reasonable use of the building or land."

Applicant's response: The uniqueness of the tenants of 50 Inner Belt Road is the main reason why they feel a fence is necessary. As a data center and enterprise internet provider, INAP, and therefore 50 Innerbelt Road houses sensitive data and routes sensitive internet traffic through it. Their customers are comprised of health care companies and banking / financial institutions, and companies conducting ecommerce. These companies require PCI and HIPPA compliancy. To that point, physical security is evaluated against their business requirements. Controlling access into the parking lot and the ability to reach the building entrances / exits is a critical criterion to which they are evaluated against when it comes to winning a new customer deal or retaining an existing customer. They have had multiple incidents in their parking lot where they have had to deal with trespassers on the property and their customers have taken note of this. This fence is critical to prevent trespassers, but also to meet their customers' physical security needs.

Additionally, the fences of the properties adjacent to 50 Inner Belt Road have fences of the following heights: an overall 9'0 wire fence (7'8" not including the barbed wire at the top) and a 7'6" fence wire fence. Installing a fence that is not similar in height to those surrounding will not only look odd, but will undermine the purpose of building the fence, which is an atmosphere of sound security that INAP requires. As this is necessary for INAP to continue to work in this area, this should fall under reasonable use of the land.



Board response: The proposed fence is the minimum relief necessary and reasonable to keep the data center secure.

3. "The granting of the variance would be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this Ordinance and would not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare."

Applicant's response: Building this fence will not only create a feeling of security to the company, but it will not negatively impact the area. The fence is the only aspect of the construction proposed. No parking spots will be eliminated, and there will be no encroachment onto the sidewalk or road. It will cause no change to those who are allowed to enter the property, but will only privatize the property as required by the tenant. This is also not a barbed wire fence which could pose physical risk to anyone who attempts to climb it. The fence will make the area look organized as it will be similar in height to any fences around it, and secure yet not overtly threatening.

Board response: The proposed fence in this industrial neighborhood will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this Ordinance. Also, it will not be injurious to the neighborhood or detrimental to the public welfare.

III. DECISION

Present and sitting were, Susan Fontano, Danielle Evans, Anne Brockelman, Elaine Severino, and Drew Kane. Upon making the above findings, Danielle Evans made a motion to approve the requested variance. Elaine Severino seconded the motion. The Zoning Board of Appeals voted **5-0** to **APPROVE** the request **WITH CONDITIONS**. The following conditions were attached:

#	Condition		Timeframe for Compliance	Verified (initial)	Notes
	Approval is for the construction of fences. This approval is based upon the following application materials and the plans submitted by the Applicant:		BP/CO	ISD/Pln g.	
1	Date (Stamp Date)	Submission			
	August 7, 2019	Initial application submitted to the City Clerk's Office			
	June 26, 2019	Proposed site plan			
	April 17, 2015	Fence detail			
	Any changes to the approved site plan that are not <i>de minimis</i> must receive SPGA approval.				
Cor	struction Impacts				
2	All construction materials and equipment must be stored onsite. If occupancy of the street layout is required, such occupancy must be in conformance with the requirements of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and the prior approval of the Traffic and Parking Department must be obtained.		During Construction	T&P	
Mis	cellaneous		1	I	1



	TT1 - A - 1' 1' 1 - 11 1 -	Cont	ICD			
3	The Applicant, its successors and/or assigns, shall be	Cont.	ISD			
	responsible for maintenance of both the building and all on-					
	site amenities, including landscaping, fencing, lighting,					
	parking areas and storm water systems, ensuring they are					
	clean, well kept and in good and safe working order.					
Public Safety						
4	The Applicant or Owner shall meet the Fire Prevention	CO	FP			
	Bureau's requirements.					
Final Sign-Off						
5	The Applicant shall contact Planning Staff at least five	Final sign	Plng.			
	working days in advance of a request for a final inspection	off				
	by Inspectional Services to ensure the proposal was					
	constructed in accordance with the plans and information					
	submitted and the conditions attached to this approval.					
Miscellaneous						
6		Perpetual	ISD /			
	The fences can never be solid and must remain see-through.		Plng.			
7	The perimeter fence may be no taller than seven feet in	Perpetual	ISD /			
	height.		Plng.			
8	The portion of the perimeter fence at the intersection must	BP/	ISD /			
	be cut back to not impair visibility. The applicant must	Perpetual	Plng.			
	submit an updated plan showing this feature to Planning					
	Staff prior to the issuance of a building permit.					
		1				



Attest, by the Zoning Board of Appeals:	Susan Fontano, <i>Chair</i> Danielle Evans, <i>Clerk</i> Anne Brockelman Elaine Severino Drew Kane (Alt.)
Attest, by Planner: Alexander Mello	
Copies of this decision are filed in the Somerville City Clerk's office. Copies of all plans referred to in this decision and a detailed record of the SPGA proceedings are filed in the Somerville Planning Dept.	
<u>CLERK'S CERTIFICATE</u>	
Any appeal of this decision must be filed within twenty days City Clerk, and must be filed in accordance with M.G.L. c. 40.	
In accordance with M.G.L. c. 40 A, sec. 11, no variance shat certification of the City Clerk that twenty days have elapsed af Clerk and no appeal has been filed, or that if such appeal has recorded in the Middlesex County Registry of Deeds and indeed of record or is recorded and noted on the owner's certificate of	ter the decision has been filed in the Office of the City as been filed, that it has been dismissed or denied, is exed in the grantor index under the name of the owner
Also in accordance with M.G.L. c. 40 A, sec. 11, a special popularing the certification of the City Clerk that twenty days Office of the City Clerk and either that no appeal has been frecorded in the Middlesex County Registry of Deeds and indee of record or is recorded and noted on the owner's certificat appealed Special Permit does so at risk that a court will revunder the permit may be ordered undone.	have elapsed after the decision has been filed in the filed or the appeal has been filed within such time, is exed in the grantor index under the name of the owner e of title. The person exercising rights under a duly
The owner or applicant shall pay the fee for recording or reg Inspectional Services shall be required in order to proceed wit and upon request, the Applicant shall present evidence to recorded.	h any project favorably decided upon by this decision,
This is a true and correct copy of the decision filed on and twenty days have elapsed, and FOR VARIANCE(S) WITHIN there have been no appeals filed in the Office of the any appeals that were filed have been finally dismiss FOR SPECIAL PERMIT(S) WITHIN there have been no appeals filed in the Office of the there has been an appeal filed.	City Clerk, or sed or denied.



Signed___

<u>City Clerk</u> Date